REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the Non-final Office Action mailed August 6, 2008. Claims 1 to 15, 17 to 22, and 24 to 29 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 17, and 26 are in independent form. No claims are being amended in this response. Please charge deposit account number 02-1818 for any fees due in association with this Response.

The Office Action rejected each of the independent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lucero* (U.S. Patent 6,019,283). This Office Action is substantially identical to the Office Action mailed October 4, 2005. Notably, Applicants already overcame that rejection.

Essentially, the only difference between the current rejection based on *Lucero* and the previous rejection based on *Lucero* is that a different member of the same patent family was used. More specifically, the previous rejection was based on U.S. Patent No. 5,457,306, and this rejection is based on U.S. Patent No. 6,019,283. The specifications of these two patents are essentially identical with the exception of the addition of FIG. 7 and the corresponding description beginning in column 8. Each of the citations in the present Office Action point to essentially identical language as the previous Office Action. With respect to the independent claims, there are no citations in the present Office Action to the description of FIG. 7 (i.e., the new matter in this later version of *Lucero*).

As previously and successfully argued, all of the currently pending claims are patentable over *Lucero*. More specifically, each of the independent claims recites two independent processors and/or control units. One of the processors/controllers is a game processor (e.g., to provide a slot machine game), and the other processor/controller is an electronic funds transfer (EFT) unit (e.g., to communicate with an outside financial institution). As claimed, these two processors/controllers operate without direct communication there between because the gaming system and the EFT system may be regulated by two different bodies. Typically, the gaming system is regulated by a state gaming commission, and the EFT system is regulated by the banking industry.

Because gaming systems and EFT systems are regulated by different bodies, an embodiment of the present invention contemplates the purchase an approved EFT device (e.g., approved by the banking industry) that maybe physically installed in the same cabinet as an approved gaming device (e.g., approved by a state gaming commission). The game processor and the casino's ticket validation network are not used to send EFT requests to the remote fund repository (e.g., a bank). Similarly, the EFT control unit and the EFT network are not used to validate casino tickets.

In this manner, each device may be constructed and approved separately from the other device. In other words, if the game processor or the casino's ticket validation network were used to send EFT requests, the gaming device would require approval by the banking industry in addition to approval by the state gaming commission. Similarly, if the EFT processor or the EFT network were used to validate casino tickets printed for players, the EFT device would require approval by the state gaming commission in addition to approval by the banking industry.

This idea of having one system to handle gaming functions and another system to handle EFT functions is documented in the specification. For example, see:

> Referring now to Fig. 4, a general electronic configuration of the electronic funds transfer system for the gaming device 10 is illustrated. For reference, the processor 38 described above that communicates with the ticket validation network 116, is illustrated. The system includes an EFT control unit 130, which has a processor 132 and a memory device 134. It should be appreciated that in one preferred embodiment, the processor 38 does not connect to or communicate directly with the EFT control unit 130. (page 26, lines 15-21; emphasis added)
>
> While the EFT control unit 130 and the processor 38 are preferably physically housed in the same gaming device 10 in this embodiment, the two devices do not directly communicate. (page 31, lines 1-4; emphasis added)

Lucero does not teach or suggest a game processor and a separate electronic funds transfer control unit that do not directly communicate with each other as currently

claimed. This distinction between *Lucero* and the present invention is most readily seen by comparing Fig. 2 of *Lucero* with Fig. 9 of the present application.

Fig. 2 of *Lucero* shows a communication path 34 between the slot machine operating mechanism 36 and the card reader 26. *Lucero* teaches that the card reader 26 communicates EFT information to the slot machine operating mechanism 36 via the communication path 34. For example:

> The reader 26 is coupled with a remote card approval financial institution 28 where it is determined if the charge card is entitled to the credit requested and, optionally, if the person requesting playing credit is the rightful user of the card and meets any other conditions for the grant of the requested playing credit. Status of the card is returned over line 30 to reader 26 where status information is supplied to the liquid crystal display 18 on line 32. If the card is invalid, or the person requesting the playing credit is not entitled to it, the display so indicates. If the card is acceptable for the amount of credit desired, the liquid crystal display 18 gives instructions on making use of the credit through the use of the keyboard 20. The information generated through the keyboard 20 is coupled on line 21 to reader 26 which provides the necessary signals on line [3]4 to the gaming machine operating mechanism 36 to allow the player to use the credit by operating the gaming machine. (col. 4, lines 47 to 64; emphasis added)

In contrast, the present application teaches a game processor 38 and an EFT controller 130 (e.g., within gaming device 410) that do not have a direct communication path between them (See Fig. 9). The game processor 38 connects to a ticket validation network 116, and the EFT controller 130 connects to an EFT network 140. This construction allows for separate components to be regulated separately as described above.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that each of the pending independent claims, as well as all claims that depend from those independent claims, are each patentably distinguished from *Lucero*. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously

solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 
Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Customer No. 29159
(312) 807-4284

Dated: November 6, 2008